

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-57 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-57 stand rejected. Applicants hereby submit new claim 58. Entry of the present amendment and further examination of the present application in view of the following remarks is hereby requested.

### **Examiner Interview**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the undersigned representative during the telephonic interviews held on July 9, 2010. During the interview, Applicants' representative discussed the outstanding 101, 112, and 103 rejections. Agreement was reached that the 101 and 112 rejections would be withdrawn in view of the presently amended claims. The Examiner also agreed that the amendments overcome the 103 rejection. Finally, the Examiner provided helpful suggestions for amendments that would further expedite allowance of the application.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

Claims 1, 17, 33, 38, 43, 48, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

The Examiner contends that the scope of the element, "normalizing the signature trace to an arc length of 1 and a total time to produce the signature to 1" is unclear. Applicants have amended the claims to recite "normalizing the signature trace such that an arc length of the signature trace is a unit measurement of length and normalizing a total time to produce the signature is a unit measurement of time." It was agreed during the July 9 interview that the amendments would overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101**

Claims 17-37, and 48-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Applicants have amended the claims to recite “using a computing device.” It was agreed during the July 9 interview that such an amendment would overcome the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1-7, 15-23, 31-48, 51, 55, 56, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over by Plamondon (US 5,101,437) with Geiger et. al (US 20060050962), and further in view of Hu et. al (US 6,157,731). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, in part:

a second extraction means for extracting data relating to different parts of the normalized signature trace, the data comprising signature angle and distance data, wherein the data is extracted such that a variance between signatures from the user is minimized and variance between signatures from other users is maximized.

Support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraphs 0025, 0036, and 0046 of the specification.

In pages 8-10 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Plamondon and Geiger do not teach a second extraction means for extracting data relating to different parts of the normalized signature trace. The Examiner contends that Hu teaches the missing element. While Hu generally teaches a signature verification method using hidden Markov models, Hu does not teach or suggest “the data comprising signature angle and distance data, wherein the data is extracted such that a variance between signatures from the user is minimized and variance between signatures from different users is maximized” as now recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Plamondon, Geiger, and Hu fails to teach or suggest claim 1. During the July 9 interview, the Examiner agreed that the above amendment

would overcome the 35 USC §103 rejection. Applicants have amended claims 17, 33, 38, 43, 48 and 55 to recite similar features as claim 1. For at least the reasons cited above with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that Plamondon, Geiger, and Hu do not disclose or render obvious independent claims 17, 33, 38, 43, 48 and 55. Since Plamondon, Geiger, and Hu fail to disclose all of the elements of the independent claims, dependent Claims 2-7, 15-16, 18-23, 31-32, 34-37, 39-42, 44-48, 51, and 56-57 cannot be rendered obvious by the cited combination per MPEP §2143.03. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103 rejection as to claims 1-7, 15-23, 31-48, 51, 55, 56, and 57.

Claims 12 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Plamondon, Geiger, Hu, and further in view of Obata (US 5,553,156). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Obata does not cure the deficiencies of Plamondon, Geiger, and Hu. Obata is generally directed to signature recognition using a fuzzy net which implements a linear function in its output layer to shorten the learning period. However, Obata, alone or in combination with Plamondon, Geiger, and Hu, does not teach or suggest claims 1 and 17 as amended above. Since the combination of Plamondon, Geiger, and Hu with Obata fails to disclose all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 17 upon which claims 12 and 28 depend, claims 12 and 28 cannot be rendered obvious by the cited combinations per MPEP §2143.03. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103 rejection as to claims 12 and 28.

Claims 13, 14, 29, 30, 49, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Plamondon, Geiger, Hu, and further in view of Collot et. al (US 5,042,073). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Collot does not cure the deficiencies of Plamondon, Geiger, and Hu. Collot generally discloses a signature verification method with optimization of static parameters. However, Collot, alone or in combination with Plamondon, Geiger, and Hu, does not teach or suggest claims 1, 17, and 48 as amended above. Since the combination of Plamondon, Geiger, and Hu with Collot fails to disclose all of the elements of independent claims 1, 17, and 48 upon which claims 13, 14, 29, 30, 49, and 50 depend, claims 13, 14, 29, 30, 49, and 50 cannot be rendered

**DOCKET NO.:** \*\*03-0005  
**Application No.:** 10/500,854  
**Office Action Dated:** May 25, 2010

**PATENT**

obvious by the cited combinations per MPEP §2143.03. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103 rejection.

### **New Claim 58**

Applicants submit new claim 58. Support for the claims may be found at least in paragraphs 0032 to 0037 of the specification. During the July 9 interview, the Examiner agreed to consider the new claim.

### **CONCLUSION**

By the remarks and the amendments provided herein, the Applicant respectfully submits that the issues raised in the Office Action dated May 25, 2010 have been traversed and that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any concerns regarding the response provided herein, or wishes to discuss the response further, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Date: August 19, 2010

/Han Gim/

Han Gim

Registration No. 62,953

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439